

To Whom It May Concern:

On June 3, 2011, Chris Conrad and I (Kyle Beagley) conducted a reclamation visit to the GRD Gypsum reclamation site in Township 19 South, Range 10 East, Section 23. The following data was collected resulting in the corresponding determination.

Reference Site

A reference site that displayed a good representation of the surrounding undisturbed vegetation was located directly west, on top of the hill, from the reclamation site. The plot was 9 square meters in size. The following vegetation was observed within this area:

<u>Species</u>	<u>Plant Count</u>
Indian Ricegrass	4
Shadscale	9
Gajetta Grass	68
Tansymustard	13
Phacelia crenulata	8
Navajo tea (thelesperma subnudum)	15

Total Plants – 117

Percent cover based on ocular observation – approximately 25%

Reclamation Site

The same technique was used to select a 9 square meter monitoring plot that displayed a good representation of vegetative growth within the reclamation area. The following vegetation was observed within this area:

<u>Species</u>	<u>Plant Count</u>
Gardners Saltbrush	1
Shadscale	12
Wildrye grass	4
Indian Ricegrass	1
<i>Halogeton (not counted, undesirable)</i>	<i>hundreds</i>

Total Plants – 18

Percent cover based on ocular observation – approximately 5-10%

Findings

The reclamation site has less plant diversity and contains significantly more undesirable plant species compared to the reference site. The reclamation site attains 20-40% vegetative cover when compared to the reference site (objective is 75%).

Determination

It is determined that based on the lack of plant diversity and percent of vegetative cover within the reclamation plot that this site should not be considered as fully successful reclamation.

RECEIVED
SEP 04 2012
Div. of Oil, Gas & Mining